

## **Questions brought up at the March 9 Deer Trustee Meeting**

### **M) We feel the Conservation Congress must have a more active role in deer management decision-making at the local level**

- Good questions
- The congress already has an active role and it should continue
- Needs discussion? What about the general public? After all it is local!
  
- Do currently CC board feel their opinions are not being heard?
  
- Need more info, I know little about how the CC works and it's idle. I would like to know more history from AI on how it's worked in the past.
  
- WCC should set goals with game managers in each specific DMU in meetings. WCC never know why the goal was set why it is.
  
- How many / which rules went through legislation without conservation congress input?
- Which and how many rules have been successful through conservation congress?

1)

### **B) Simplify the regulatory process by setting antlerless harvest goals, harvest regulations and antlerless permit quotas on a 3-5 year cycle.**

- 3 year basis sounds good
- Agree that the more the exposure the more the pain and discontent
- Good, should be tried, may have to be changed over time
- Strongly disagree! 3-5 year is too long to accurately determine population numbers. What if a severe winter hits or a disease outbreak.
- I like this recommendation it can decrease confusion & lower the chance of accidental unintentional violations
  
- Get information on number of violations based on change frequency
  
- What is past 3-5 year dmU data show for DMU's changes?
- What about special conditions? Two bad winter years. Need emergency rules?
- Support 3-5 year cycle – need mulit year data

- We need to know how volatile populations can move in 3 years..5 years and so on
- How will a heavy winter event impact 3 or 5 year timeframe? What is the current duration of reviews if its not already 3-5 years?
- Data on yearly estimate how much do they vary each year? Plus or minus 10% 20%...?
- At the start I would ask if we should start in a lesser time frame until we think we have population clarity
- Must be able to respond to changes due to owk (over winter kill)
- Would there be an opportunity to make “emergency” adjustments for example – winter kill like 2007/08
- Need current process, congress consideration, legislators, NRB
- What % are there already order 4 antlerless now?
- Will limiting antlerless permits limit number of bucks (EAB permit) in CWD zone?
- How would local vendor know if hunter has already purchased?

## 2)

### 1) **Base antlerless permit quotas on DMU historical demand.**

- How many people purchase more than 2 permits per unit?
- Leave alone
- Extra tags in place of free tags?
- Set quotas as it seems to improve the perception thus improving hunter DNR relationships
- Use them or should read purchase them vs unlimited free permits?
- Yes
- How will this recommendation be changed when DMU’s change and numbers change accordingly?
- If followed, won’t this just insure a continued increase in the herd? Don’t you need to look at other methods/ways to reduce the herd?
- Are there people purchasing antlerless permits with the intent of never using them?
- Maximum historical demand?
- Number of permits issued and used?

- How do we track bonus antlerless kills vs regular tags?

3)

**J) Increase the cost of all antlerless tags for regular and herd control units to \$12**

- No needed information
- Very good question, should any free tag be allowed?
- Why hold it to \$12.00? It should be higher
- Should we continue giving free tags with regulation?
- Does this include CWD-MZ?
- Will the current “free” tags you get with your license not cost \$12.00?
- What is the expected revenue and it’s use?
- Is this for the additional tags? Or the ones with the regular tag?
- Is this referring to the additional antlerless tags?
- No, the \$2.00 tags I hear are more effective at harvesting antlerless deer. Would like more stats on this
- What method process is needed to make changes?
- Can this be enforced?
- How many violations have occurred in the past few years on this?
- How many deer farms have CWD? Why not stop this problem?
- Info pertaining to the effectiveness in enforcement
- What counties are baiting and feeding?

4)

**K) Consider charging a fee for antlerless tags in the CWD zone.**

- Yes, \$2.00
- I’m okay with this. ?
- Yes, \$6.00 everybody loves a ½ off bargain
- Change to have value \$3.00-\$5.00
- Would there be any limit on permits?
- Why? Don’t we want deer shot here? Will a change really give value to the antlerless segment?
- How many tags total/used?

5)

**A) Reduce the number of DMU's and combine the farmland regions**

- Where are the chronic herd control units?
- Reduce from existing number of DMU's to county that takes us from 131 DMU's to 72. What are the DNR's concerns with this change?
- Current population & harvest data for existing farmland DMU's?
  
- I would like a map of what a farmland unit would look like. I would like a map of public access land for considering making public land units.
- Need to know the percentage of private land within current DMUs
- Where are the farmland regions?
- What do you mean by the farmland regions? How big of an area?
- Need to know the extent of the farmland regions, map it out.
- What is considered farmland region? Number of farmland in a county? Percent woodland in a region? By county – multi county
- What portion of Wisconsin is considered farmland region? What are habitat differences in the farmland units can they be managed as 1 unit?
- Topographical and satellite maps of current DMU's
- Plot maps of DMU's
- How many units have farmland mixed with forest areas
  
- Farmland units should be broken into smaller units based on ecosystems one unit seems too large
- Kill by DMU and by county
- Not 1 farmland region
- Yes, DMU's need to be reduced
- Reduce number of DMU's. Establish farmland units
- Possibly 8-10 units
- "Farmland" covers more than one habitat type
- Sure, less units sounds better
- If a county i.e Iowa county is geographically split North of Hwy 18 how will S of Hwy 18 able to be managed
  
- Are we prepared to change DMU's to some other criteria than similar habitat type?
- Would farmland region be more liberal or less liberal with antlerless tags?
- Is there a scientifically recommended minimum size?

- Why reduce DMU's? Simply to get better deer estimate numbers?
- What are geographically similar areas comprising Wisconsin?
- Should state, county, federal forests be separate units? Most are big enough.
- Need to know where similar habitat areas are throughout the state to determine DMU boundaries

5)

**L) Establish a public lands antlerless permit system**

- Good?
- Yes
- If hunters on public land seem to like quotas or antlerless deer and public tags then do it
- Public land owners – generally grow trees – they don't want deer numbers to determine understory growth
- How do other states manage tags on public vs private lands?
- What other states have public land permits? How do they work?
- What other states do this and how do they do this?
- What lands? How large a unit? Public lands become own unit?
- Figure how to sell only to non-landowners should not be sold only to non – land owners
- How many landowners/hunters shoot antlerless on public land but not on the land they hunt bucks?
- What if public & private lands are intermixed?

6)

**C) Limit antlerless deer harvest in regular and herd control zones**

- Yes
- Looks like total max of 4 tags (2 extra) is bet in herd control units not regular units?
- Current limits
- Current herd estimate of antlerless
- What is impact on deer population?
- How many people buy how many tags?

- How many people do this? Why? Has this been a problem?
- If people are upset, they can also purchase a permit
- Data with information on average number of deer per hunter
- How many people actually harvest 2 or more deer?
- Is this information showing number of deer registered per individual, i.e. hunters # - 1 deer shot by 1 hunter, # - 2 deer shot by 1 hunter, # - 3 deer shot by 1 hunter etc
- Different for CWD zone or other units?
- How will group bagging affect number of tags issued?

8)

**D) Re-evaluate the effectiveness of the October antlerless seasons in the CWD zone**

- Are you in favor of an antlerless hunting October in CWD zone? If yes, how valuable is it?
- Info pertaining to public opinion on October season
- Need information of harvest and participation by unit
- Success ratio
- Estimated number of hunters to harvested deer
- Need to see number of deer harvested in October compared to total harvest. Has harvest numbers significantly changed before, during, after? Has archery harvest been affected?
- If the number of antlerless deer harvested during the October hunt has plummeted since the EAB in CWD zones has changes to the "bonus buck" rule then do away with the October hunt?
- Kill info prior to CWD and since CWD
- Over the years what has the harvest data shown? How many hunters participate what is the success rate?
- Was there a reduction in antlerless kill in 2012 vs year with October hunt?
- Effectiveness without an earn a buck requirement
- Did regulation season in 2012 have more or less participants than years with October hunt

- Can of worms – harvest trends vs infection trends. What are other options?

9)

**E) Maintain the current buck limit of one buck per deer gun license (may be used in muzzleloader season) and one buck per Archery Deer License**

- No Change outside CWD zone, potential tweaks
- Change the buck limit for gun & muzzleloader to 2, and for 2 in bow
- Do you favor present regulations for buck quota, 1 gun and 1 bow? What if crossbows were allowed for 55 ☐ All ☐ prior to gun season?
- How many people take 2 bucks per year?
- Does this include CWD-MZ

10

**F) Maintain the Bonus Buck Regulations in CWD – MZ**

- Get rid of bonus buck opportunity in CWD zones, and go back to EAB in CWD zones
- Needs more discussion and thought
- How many hunters shot more than 3 bucks with a bow
- How many hunters shot a second buck with a bonus buck permit? Percent of total kill?
- Data for number of second buck in CWD
- How does this tie into “passive” CWD management?
- What is the buck population in CWD? Before and after CWD?
- Has a CWD zone ever gone away?
- Would go away if CWD zone is eliminated? Legal language defines CWD zone comes into play, if CWD zone doesn’t exist special regs that pertain specifically to CWD zone wouldn’t exist either?
- Is there a chance this could go state wide?
- Yes, but re-evaluate if CWD zone goes statewide

11)

**G) Resolve the cross-bow season issue through the public involvement process**

- The public involvement process should be surveys
- Why not expand the archery season
- Needs more thought and discussion
- Crossbows are not archery equipment!
- Would you accept a shortened archery season if crossbows were allowed for more users. 55 ☐ All ☐
- Crossbows need to be limited to older or disabled hunters. The legislative needs to stay out of the issue
- Can you provide the results of DNR mail surveys and conservation congress votes on full inclusion of crossbows? Not age 55 questions just full inclusion questions
- Conservation congress process
- Is this a legislative matter?
- What is the crossbow issue?
- What are current Regulations?

12)

**H) Resolve the baiting and feeding issue outside CWD affected areas**

- If CWD keeps spreading, this question goes away
- Outlaw feeding and baiting statewide. It's not hunting in my opinion that makes hunters look bad to not hunting public and it spreads disease
- Baiting – affects on disabled hunters
- Any studies done on how deer habitats are affected by baiting, nocturnal, change in movement, increase disease, etc?
- What other groups impacted by elimination?
- Need to address bait is a deer problem – does not relate to use of bait for bear



- What kind of push back is there from other groups? – Vendors – Bear hunters
- How much is spent on bait/feeding each year? Is income important to some states?
- How many people feed outside the deer season?
- How many people would stop hunting without baiting
- How many people bait during the deer season?
- How many hunters/camps currently use baiting?
- Biological info on deer behavior changes with baiting i.e. going nocturnal, disease transmission
- Is baiting and feeding worth having based on disease spreading?
- What is the value \$ of the industry? They are vocal in keeping it.
- What are the numbers for baiting? Feeding?
- Hunter conflicts deer behavior commercial dealer response violations
- Definition of “bait”?
- What is baiting?
- What is current penalty?

## Herd Health/CWD Management Action Team Meeting

03/09/13

Attendees: Tami Ryan, Tim Marien, Mike Foy, Marc Schultz, Tony Grabski, Julie Langenberg, Jim Riphon, & Gene Reineking

### Review of Survey Questions

- General Comments:
  - Have we already reviewed/analyzed many of these survey questions in previous surveys?
    - Are we recreating the wheel?
    - Similar surveys done in the past
  - Allow the option to fill out the intro section and then be able to pick what section you want to do next
    - Allow to save and continue at a later date
    - Consider all: incomplete and complete
  - Include one question in the DMAP section on a CWD component
  - Some clerical items to clean up
    - Consistency in ranking system, sometimes a 1 means low and another 1 means high
    - DMAP question #3 has lines and response issues
  - How are we going to do outreach for the survey?
    - CWD-MZ landowner list
    - Farmers
    - DNR homepage “splash” page
  - You must read a brief background/executive summary before making an informed answer before reading the CWD section
  - We are *not* snail mailing the survey
    - This will exclude a generation of hunters
- Add a question after #1 are you concerned about possible human health concerns
- Question #2: How will we know their geographic distribution?
  - Concern about a bias in the north vs. south
  - Don't ask if they live in CWD-MZ
  - We need to better define what is passive vs. aggressive
- Question #3: Develop another question for options to define an aggressive approach
- Question #4:

- Need intro material, how strategies and methods would work
  - There is more interest in strategies vs. methods
  - Balance cost and efficacy vs. focus on certain areas
  - Insert the word “random” because for outstate sampling it is not a true random sample
  - Add an “other” option and ability for survey respondents to write in
- Question #6:
  - Format #6 similar to #4 so you can get specific responses to each form of strategy
  - This question is what we can do right now that is politically/socially acceptable
- Question #7:
  - Remove the option of “Do nothing”, almost no one will be in favor of do nothing
    - Many people will oppose the first three and check “do nothing” by default
  - Add the option incorporate a CWD aspect into DMAP program
- Question #8:
  - Add the choice that the boundary should be expanded to incorporate new positives
- Question #9:
  - Baiting and feeding ban is not always a CWD issue
- Question #10A:
  - Should include “adult deer” in all of the answers
- CWD DTR #9
  - No survey question
  - We do already have a Wildlife Health Section
  - Survey question not needed
  - Team will look at how WH can assist with DMAP
- CWD DTR #10:
  - Action team does not want to work this...not needed (Charlotte the Deer)
- Add a question about the effectiveness of the Holiday Hunt: pro/con/unsure
- Add a question about CWD test turnaround time
  - We are currently at 21 days; Is this good/bad?
  - What would you pay for a quicker turnaround time?

## **DMAP Action Group Notes**

**March 9, 2013**

DNR staff present: Jeff Pritzl, Tom Hauge, Eric Lobner, Scott Roepke, Scott Gunderson, Kurt Thiede

DMAP Action group participants: Robert Benson (QDMA), Andy Pantzlaff (United Sportsman of WI), Doug Seidl (WCC), Jane Severt (WCFA), Greg Szalewski (WI Traditional Archers), Joe Caputo (WCC), Ralph Fritsch (WWF), Dale Zaug (WWOA), Bill Horvath (WWOA)

Jeff – If you want to learn more about Jeff, please visit his blog:

<http://wdnr.blogs.govdelivery.com/>

**Presentation:** Jeff gave some additional details about the potential components of DMAP to begin the thought process. Maintaining healthy deer herds while maintaining habitat integrity is a primary goal of DMAP. The long term threat to deer hunting may be that hunters may not be able to adequately manage the deer herd in the future, and society will seek other control mechanisms. Leopold's conservation vision is a state of harmony between men and land. The agency was only intended to be an interim management authority until the general public could take over after acquiring the necessary knowledge to make responsible decisions. This is similar to what DMAP could be like. DMAP is more than just deer. It could be a chance to get to what Leopold wanted.

Will we pilot DMAP? Guynn recommended a 2 year pilot. Other states have used much longer pilots but we probably don't have that luxury in WI. This group will be able to weigh-in on whether or not we should have a pilot.

Fritsch – A pilot may depend on how many DNR personnel are available. Will we use UW extension staff? For example, if we have \_# of DNR staff available, how far can you expand it – \_# trial areas?

Pantzlaff – the CWD area is different than the north, south, east, and west. Would recommend doing a pilot all over the state. Students could intern to help out. Boots on the ground was a big factor in the DTR, this includes biologist and forester involvement.

Tom – Ralph's question is a data request that we can do for the next meeting. Building relationships through DMAP should probably include using DNR biologists.

Horvath – There are 327,000 woodland owners in WI. Half own less than 10 acres. Landowners in the north own more land than those in the south. Land management also varies across the state. There are 300 land and water conservation staff out there, 200+ NRCS agents and lots of biologists. Use the other groups that are out there. Thinks we should have pilots, two years will be too short though. We will need to evaluate how it works, how will we expand it, etc.

Benson – agrees with a pilot. DMAP will be similar to QDMA. We will need to figure out the advantages to the landowners so that we can sell the program.

Fritsch – The pilot properties can be used as demonstration areas to expand the program.

Lobner – DMAP could be similar to MFL, where private contractors are certified to write management plans. It's really up to this group.

Pantzlaff – Opponent of earn-a-buck, our kids need to be able to see deer but we can't let populations get too high.

Caputo – DMAP needs to be around long term and we need to be able to bring in the public. There is no blueprint for DMAP. We have the opportunity to start from scratch with this.

Fritsch – the northern part of the state should be managed differently than the southern half. We need to restructure the relationship between landowners and the department.

Zaug – expectations are high for deer hunting. The food (young forest) is gone in the north. This is a people management problem. We also need to be talking about taxes.

Horvath – will need to group landowners together to make DMAP more effective.

Severt – forestry and wildlife staff are already working together. The Division of Forestry priority is to pull back resources from MFL to be more efficient. There will be more resources put into lands that are not enrolled in MFL. So there will be this switch in focus in Div of Forestry. Wildlife management might be the trigger to get some landowners involved in forestry.

Horvath – workshops are held annually by various groups involved with habitat management. There are ways to reduce DNR efforts in getting things organized if we put our heads together. There are a lot of tools out there that can be pulled together.

Benson – the customer is the landowner. How do we show them the benefits? They want to see deer and some nice bucks mixed in. People want to be educated. How can people improve their habitats? We need to focus on the customer. What are the goals of the landowner? It's about education. People want biologists to come out to the property and educate them.

Pritzl – Guynn said the most rewarding aspect of DMAP is watching landowners transition from being deer hunters to land managers and botanists and having them make sustainable decisions because they want to make them not because they are forced to.

Caputo – This group doesn't representing the public as a whole, which we need to be cautious about. Is there something that's already been completed that streamlines all of the opportunities?  
Hauge – not aware of any efficiency process improvements relative to delivery of services to landowners. Maybe we should look at who's doing it right. Is there somebody that we could follow?

Caputo – how do we find a way to get the mechanics done?

Pantzlaff – we need landowner participation. There will be key people participating in DMAP that will step up. The DNR can train people who will then train others participants. When the trainers don't know how to handle a process they can go back to the DNR. The biological data can be collected by the landowners. DMAP was originally intended to reduce deer herds but it can also work in the opposite direction.

Horvath – as a society, we don't necessarily work together. Demands of each bureau/agency limit cooperation. We need to focus on working together.

Zaug –we need to look at other states for minimum acreages.

Benson –Participating landowners will need to be spending money and many will be willing. People will want to jump on board if DMAP is a success.

Hauge – DMAP can apply to public lands as well, including county, state, and federal forests. You folks are gateways to bigger memberships. Please spread the word on the survey so that we can collect their thoughts as well.

Pantzlaff – suggests adding “with your input” to the recommended antlerless harvest questions.

Horvath – landowners often manage for more than deer. Can we ask a question about managing for other wildlife? Roepke – there is a question on the survey that ask potential participants if they would be interested in managing for wildlife other than deer.

Caputo –we need to be looking at DMAP from a public perspective. What does DMAP mean to the general public. We can't forget about the public land hunters or non-landowners. We can't lose the public/private landowner relationship.

Benson- how does DMAP apply to state forests?

Caputo – what do we want it to mean? Expanding DMAP past private ownership? Public land hunters will be vested in management of public lands.

Sievert – There may be conflicts using DMAP on public lands. Most hunters want more deer, foresters want fewer.

Hauge – non-DMAP enrollees will want to know why they should support the program if they can't be involved.

Horvath – MFL gets criticized for not allowing hunting on all acres. The DNR should survey MFL properties to see what those lands are providing for access.

Caputo – we don't want to lock the non-landowners or non-DMAP participants out of the program.

Pantzlaff – public land in the north where regrowth is an issue may need more attention. Hunters in the north need more buy in to shoot more deer. We should conduct a pilot in areas with few deer to see if we can increase deer herds.

Caputo – this could be two programs: one for private lands and one for public lands. We can create whatever system we want. We need to be aware of the other hunters though. The DNR has been lacking in its outreach efforts. DMAP could improve the outreach between the DNR, landowners, and hunters.

DTR Meeting March 9, 2013  
Lee S Dreyfus University Center  
Facilitator: Tricia Knoot  
DNR: Karl Martin, Dan Storm

## SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTION TEAM

### MEETING GUIDELINES:

Turn off cell phones  
Stay on task/time  
Encourage participation by all  
Listen with open mind  
Be respectful of different opinions

### QUESTIONNAIRE:

#### Methodology Comments

How/who gets to take survey?

- Random selection population
- Distribution lists?
- Concern with self-selected survey
- Self-selected survey can't be interpreted the same due to biases

Comparative Survey?

- Web versus random mailing

Notifications

- Email?
- News Releases?

What are you trying to find out with survey? Goals of survey?

- What the deer hunters thinks? Rural landowner? Wisconsin citizen?
- DNR has wider stakeholder perspectives than just deer hunters

#### Broad Comments

*(In response to deer over-browsing question)*

Relative to ownership

And land uses

Ownership goals

In preamble to questions: ask if farmer or timberland owner

Question #1 Not either/or e.g. A forester is concerned about browsing & over-browsing but is also almost always a deer hunter.



## Deer Research and Science

A) Amount of agricultural crop damage from deer

B) Deer over-browsing of forest that prevent re-growth of some forest tree species

*Sticky-Note: Deer effects on forest regeneration and understory plants.*

*Sticky-Note: Do most people asked this question know how to identify the signs? (Regards to B, E, F)*

C) Population, impacts and distribution of predators

D) Amount of deer mortality during an average winter

E) Deer over-browsing of food and cover needed by deer

F) Deer over-browsing of food and cover needed by other wildlife

G) The number of deer-vehicle accidents

H) Potential disease risks to the deer herd

*Sticky-Note:Rate of harvest in disease management*

I) Trends in deer antler and body size

J) Surveys of hunters to measure satisfaction with deer hunts

*Sticky-Note: Change wording to remove the word 'survey'. Suggestion: Measures of hunter satisfaction with deer hunts.*

K) Surveys of landowners to measure their attitudes towards deer management in their area

*Sticky-Note: Change wording to remove the word 'survey'. Suggestion: Measures of landowners attitudes towards deer management in their area.*

L) Surveys of the general public to measure attitudes towards deer management in their area

*Sticky-Note: Change wording to remove the word 'survey'. Suggestion: Measures of general public attitudes towards deer management in their area.*

M) Annual harvest information from fall deer hunting seasons

N) Information from Operation Deer Watch (citizen submittal of doe:fawn observations)

O) Information from Hunter Observation Surveys (hunters submit deer seen while hunting)

P) Impact of deer and deer hunting to Wisconsin's economy

New Items:

*Sticky-Note: Diversity and stability of native plant communities*

## **DTR RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **People**

4. In addition to providing hunting opportunities, the impacts of deer depredation on agricultural crops, forest regeneration and biodiversity, deer/vehicle collisions, the special significance of deer to the Ojibwe people and other factors also must be considered in management of Wisconsin's white-tailed deer with the Voight Intertribal Task Force (GLIFWC), the tribes serving as "co-managers" where appropriate.

*Sticky-Note: Need to quantify forest effects e.g. 20 deer/sq mi is ok but 25 is too many, or 15% of seedlings browsed is ok, but 20% is too much.*

### **DNR Research and Technical Publications (no comments/info needs)**

1. We strongly suggest establishment of a research steering committee, with representation from user groups, stakeholders and regional WDNR biologists, and Tribal representatives. (Administrative)

2. A significant effort should be developed in Human Dimensions research. Wisconsin is blessed with two excellent researchers (Holsman at UW-SP and Petchenik in house), and a plan for long-term monitoring of trends and issues should be developed between them.

5. There is a need for a long-term research plan (developed through 1), based on needs assessments, and prioritized for funding. (Administrative)

6. Synergies with other agencies and greater cooperative efforts, particularly with those in forestry and geospatial disciplines, would help leverage funding and strengthen projects.

7. Research projects should be of an applied nature, rather than basic research with clearly defined application to the needs for managing Wisconsin's deer and habitat resources. (Administrative)

8. Project results should be extended to the public through media, workshops and field days, as part of the DMAP program and regional stakeholder conferences. (DMAP)

## **Chronic Wasting Disease**

2. There is a clear need for a new sampling protocol for CWD in Wisconsin, one that gives a true picture of the progress of the disease; but more importantly, one designed to detect spread. (Herd Health/CWD)

*Sticky-Note: Justification is faulty! This is a weakness of DTR.*

*Sticky-Note: What's the basis for dismissing current protocol? Are we not already measuring increase in prevalence and spatial extent?*

8. WDNR should work closely (through the local biologist) with the Conservation Congress in developing goals and strategies at the county level.

9. We feel use of human dimensions research to anticipate, rather than reacting to issues as they arise would be very effective. (Herd Health/CWD)

## **Harvest Data, Herd Health and Productivity**

1. Involving the public in data collection produces many benefits, including buy-in on management and harvest strategies and cost-efficiencies of data collection.

*Sticky-Note: Getting "buy-ins" from hunters on deer population estimates would be great – good luck!*

*Sticky-Note: Why aren't we collecting more valuable information at check-in stations?*

2. Each field biologist should be required to organize and conduct at least one field necropsy study each year, conducted along with cooperators and volunteers during late winter.

*Sticky-Note: Do we have baseline data describing a "healthy" deer applicable to different parts of our state? Sand country versus Agriculture? North versus South?*

*Sticky-Note: What information would you get? How would it be used?*

*Sticky-Note: Can you estimate fecundity late winter?*

## **Population Management**

1. Limit the use of SAK/accounting style models to monitoring deer population size and trends at the state and regional levels.

*Sticky-Note: Cost of losing DMU-level time-series of  $N_{sak}$ ?*

*Sticky-Note: Potential for estimating precision of SAK? Empirical estimates of SAK?*

***Sticky-Note:*** DMU versus DMAP (1, 3, 4) Since we'll be changing to DMAP is it more appropriate to use DMAP? Shouldn't eliminate any of these.

2. Do away with population goals and population estimates at the DMU level.

***Sticky-Note:*** (2 & 3) What tools/information is currently being used aside from SAK for DMU population goals & estimates? Density? Acres of habitat? What else?

***Sticky-Note:*** Existing deer management plan established population goals to balance carrying capacity of the land with hunter success and level of crop damage and forestry impacts and car collisions. We still need a realistic goal population.

3. Replace the current DMU population goal definition of comparing the deer population estimate with the desired population goal for the DMU with a simplified goal statement of increase, stabilize or decrease population density.

***Sticky-Note:*** Do states with subjective goals tend to have less intensive harvests? e.g. Fewer deer/sq mile or fewer deer/hunter?

***Sticky-Note:*** How do we know when we have attained the goal?

***Sticky-Note:*** Cost of going to a subjective assessment of herd from a quantitative.

4. Develop a set of metrics to monitor progress towards the DMU goal of increase, stabilizing, or decreasing population density.

***Sticky-Note:*** What metrics could be used to monitor or measure deer impacts on plant communities?

***Sticky-Note:*** Links to studies or summary of findings on the current status of deer damage to Wisconsin plants, forests and crops.

5. Reduce the number of DMUs and combine the Farmland regions. (Regulations/Season)

***Sticky-Note:*** Definition of "farmland regions"?

***Sticky-Note:*** Is it possible to "simplify" and combine farmland regions? What criteria were used in establishment of current DMUs?

## **Predator Studies and Management**

1. Continue to conduct research on the impacts of predators on the deer herd.

2. Involve the public as much as practical with field-based research projects.
5. Geospatial studies of predator distribution and densities, especially for wolves, should be encouraged and developed to assess long-term trends and issues.

**Closing Comments**

How to share info?

Email is preferred method

Future meetings

Different location? Less number of meetings? Web or phone?

Next meeting

April 6<sup>th</sup>

Send comments to:

DanielJStorm@wisconsin.gov